

REMARKS

Claims 1-10 and 17-32 are pending in this application and stand rejected by the examiner. Claims 1 and 30-32 are independent claims. Claim 20 has been amended to address an antecedent basis issue. Claims 3, 5, 10, 17, 19, and 29 have been amended to address minor form and clarity issues. New claim 33 has been added herein. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in light of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

Claim Rejections 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 1-10, 17-29, and 31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Specifically, the office argues that the claims are directed to software *per se*. Assignee disagrees with this position. However, to expedite prosecution, independent claims 1 and 31 are amended herein to recite that the authentication information store is on a computer-readable memory, as suggested by the office action on page 3. This amendment is supported by FIG. 1 at 29. In light of these amendments, it is respectfully requested that the § 101 rejections be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §§ 102

Claims 1-32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Owen et al. (2004/0187018). These rejections are traversed.

Claim 1 is directed to a system for distributing authentication information to users of remote devices. Claim 1 recites in combination with its other limitations that an authentication information store stores authentication information for users, and that the authentication system retrieves the authentication information for one of the plurality of users from the authentication

information store. The retrieved authentication information is provided to the remote device. Claim 1 has been amended to explicitly recite that the authentication information for the one of the plurality of users is present in the authentication information store prior to receipt of the request for authentication information.

As noted in the amendment of July 18, 2008, Owen does not disclose authentication information retrieved from a data store that is sent to the remote device, and in particular Owen does not retrieve the encrypted passcode from a data store. Assignee further noted that because the passcode disclosed by Owen is generated in response to a request, it cannot be a pre-existing passcode. The outstanding office action deemed these arguments unpersuasive because the claims did not appear to require authentication information which is expressly pre-generated and/or pre-stored, as outlined in the Response to Arguments. It is respectfully submitted that the current amendment, supported in the specification, including at paragraph [0042], addresses this concern of the office by requiring that the requested authentication information be present in the authentication information store prior to receipt of the request for authentication information. Because Owen does not teach authentication information that is pre-existing such that it is present in the authentication information store prior to receipt of the request for authentication information, it is respectfully requested that the § 102 rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn.

Similar amendments have been made to each of independent claims 30-32. It is respectfully requested that the § 102 rejections of claims 30-32 be withdrawn for similar reasons as offered for claim 1.

Claim 33 has been added. Claim 33 is supported by FIG. 1 at 29. It is respectfully submitted that Owen does not teach an authentication information store on a non-volatile

memory. As noted in the Response to Arguments on page 11 of the outstanding office action, Owen, at best, might suggest that the generated passcode would be stored on a volatile memory such as a RAM or cache. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that claim 33 is allowable.

It is noted that assignee has not submitted arguments with respect to certain of the dependent claims in the instant application. This is done without prejudice to assignee's right to present arguments with respect to each of the dependent claims at any time in the future. In addition, since each of the dependent claims depends from an independent claim that is itself allowable, the dependent claims are allowable for at least the same reasons as the independent claims.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, assignee respectfully submits that the pending claims are allowable. Therefore, the examiner is respectfully requested to pass this case to issuance.

Date: July 29, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By: John Y. Biernacki

John Y. Biernacki
Reg. No. 40,511
JONES DAY
North Point; 901 Lakeside Avenue
Cleveland, OH 44114
(216) 586-3939